UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,768	03/30/2004	Jung-Hun Seo	g-Hun Seo 5649-1263 4965	
75	590 11/15/2006		EXAM	INER
Laura M. Kelley			MOORE, KARLA A	
	bley & Sajovec, P.A.			<del></del>
P.O. Box 37428			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Raleigh, NC 27627			1763	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/812,768	SEO ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Karla Moore	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHI( - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tince will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status			•				
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Au	ugust 2006.					
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-32</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>16-30</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	6) Claim(s) 1,3-15,31 and 32 is/are rejected.						
7)	<u>.</u>						
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)🖂	The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊟ objected t	o by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
•	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	•				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen —	t(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
2)							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)  Other:							

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Objections

1. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: The depend on a cancelled claim. Appropriate correction is required. For examination purposes, it was assumed that the claims were meant to depend from claim 1.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. fThe following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1, 3-6, 9-14 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,319,766 to Bakli et al.
- 4. Bakli et al. disclose a metal deposition processing apparatus in Figures 1-3, comprising: a first processing chamber configured for holding a semiconductor substrate therein; a second processing chamber configured for holding the semiconductor therein and forming an upper metal layer thereon, wherein the first processing chamber is configured for forming a barrier metal layer on the semiconductor substrate, and the second processing chamber is configured for forming the upper metal layer on at least a portion of the barrier metal layer on the semiconductor substrate; and a transfer chamber isolated from an oxygen atmosphere and connected to the first processing chamber and the second processing chamber, the transfer chamber configured to transfer the semiconductor between the first processing chamber and the second processing chamber.
- 5. With respect to claims 3 and 4, the first processing chamber is a metal organic CVD chamber including at least one source gas supply conduit that supplies a metal organic precursor. See Figure 3.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,768 Page 3

Art Unit: 1763

6. With respect to claims 5 and 6, the first processing chamber is also configured to flush a barrier metal layer on the semiconductor substrate, using a flushing gas supply conduit (column 6, rows 7-12 and column 9, rows 37-46).

- 7. With respect to claims 9-14, the apparatus disclosed is a conventional cluster tool comprising all of the limitations recited in the claims. Additional features of the cluster tool are described in US 5,186,718, which is incorporated by reference.
- 8. With respect to claims 31 and 32, Bakli et al. further teach a controller configured to control all of the operations of the cluster tool (column 7, row 38 through column 8, row 56).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 11. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakli et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-6, 9-14 and 31-32 above.
- 12. Claims 7 and 8 are drawn to the identity of a processing gas that may be used during an intended use of the claimed apparatus.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,768 Page 4

Art Unit: 1763

13. The courts have ruled that expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim. Ex parte <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/jhi/hult.164">Thibault.164</a> USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969).

- 14. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakli et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-6, 9-14 and 31-32 above in view of by U.S. Patent 5,740,034 to Saeki.
- 15. Bakli et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed and as described above. It is further noted that Bakli et al. teach providing additional pre- and post-processing chambers as part of a cluster tool, as needed, (see US 5,186,718, which is incorporated by reference) for the purpose of providing a comprehensive manufacturing sequence for the semiconductor substrate in a single environment..
- 16. However, Bakli fail to explicitly teach providing an alignment chamber with an optical sensor.
- 17. Saeki et al. teach providing an alignment chamber (30) with an optical sensor may also be provided connected to the processing chamber for the purpose of properly positioning a wafer to be processed (column 9, row 66 through column 10, row 13).
- 18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to have provided an alignment chamber with an optical sensor in Bakli et al. in order to properly position a wafer to be processed as taught by Saeki et al.

## Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-15 and 31-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Pat Pub 2001/0005056 discloses a cluster tool for forming a barrier layer and a metal layer. JP Pat

Pub 2001041802 A teaches using TiCl4 gas in forming a barrier layer.

Art Unit: 1763

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of

the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date

of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Karla Moore whose telephone number is 571.272.1440. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571.272.1435. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative

or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-

1000.

KARLA MOORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 1763

12 November 2006